



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION AT BOSTON AND CAMBRIDGE

FROM the point of view of the general public, the chief characteristic of the Association's twenty-eighth annual meeting lay in the presence of Colonel Roosevelt, and in the power and charm of the address which he delivered as president and which we print on subsequent pages. The attractive force of his political and literary fame accounts in great measure for the large attendance, which ran to about 450 members, surpassing the number of those brought together on any previous occasion except the quarter-centennial at New York in 1909. Much attractive power lay also in the conjunction of allied societies. The American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the New England History Teachers' Association, the American Sociological Society, the American Statistical Association, and the American Association for Labor Legislation all held their meetings in Boston and Cambridge in these same days, December 27 to 31. The intervention of a Sunday among these days gave welcome relief from a programme which was, as is usual, distinctly too congested.

The arrangements made by the local committee deserve all praise and gratitude. The halls and rooms for the sessions were adequate in space (though not in oxygen) and those in Boston were convenient of access to the hotel chosen as headquarters. To many members the choice in the latter respect seemed to have fallen upon a hotel whose rates were unsuitable for academic purses; the point is worth dwelling upon because in most cities a laudable pride will cause the local committee to choose the best hotel, in spite of its expensiveness, while visiting members would in most cases be glad to be housed in modest quarters, and to take on faith the presumption that greater splendors exist elsewhere.

The Massachusetts Historical Society invited the members of the Association to luncheon on one of the days of the sessions, and Harvard University exercised similar hospitality upon another. There was also a reception for the members by President and Mrs. Lowell at Cambridge, tea at Simmons College on one of the afternoons, and "smokers" at the City Club and at the University Club. For all these hospitable entertainments the gratitude of the members was publicly and privately expressed. The sessions ended with a subscription luncheon at the Copley Plaza, at which Professor Albert Bushnell Hart presided, and at which brief addresses were made by Professor Albion W. Small, president of the American Sociological Society, President Samuel C. Mitchell of the University of South Carolina, Professor Talcott Williams of the School of Journalism of Columbia University, and President Eliot.

A characteristic note of the meeting was the prevalence of conferences for the discussion of practical problems, rather than general sessions for the reading of formal papers. The latter, aside from the evening devoted to Colonel Roosevelt's presidential address, were confined to the two last sessions, those of Monday evening, December 30, and of Tuesday forenoon, with the addition of a joint session held with the American Political Science Association on the afternoon of Monday, before the meeting for business. The Mississippi Valley Historical Association also had an open session. Practical conferences on the other hand numbered not fewer than nine, devoted respectively to the work of archivists, to ancient history, to historical bibliography, to military history, to the interests of teachers, to those of state and local historical societies, to medieval history, to American history, and to modern history. In nearly all these conferences the committee on programme and the respective chairmen had almost entire success in bringing about real and lively discussion. Their process consisted in permitting, at each conference, the reading of only one or two formal papers, the texts of which had usually been circulated among those appointed to discuss them, which they were then expected to do with the freedom of oral if not of extemporaneous discourse.

In the sessions devoted to the reading of formal papers, the long-established rule of the society limiting such papers to twenty minutes was frequently disregarded. The results of such excess of speech on the part of those who read—or of leniency on the part of those who preside—are always in some degree injurious to the success of a session, and to the interests of those who come last upon the programme.

The fourth annual conference of archivists, presided over by

Professor Herman V. Ames, was held on Saturday morning, December 28, in the building of the Massachusetts Historical Society. In opening the conference the chairman recalled the organization of the Public Archives Commission at Boston in 1900 and briefly reviewed its work, pointing out what had thus far been accomplished in the way of publishing information respecting public archives and of arousing general interest in and securing legislation for their preservation. The first contribution to the programme was an informal report by Mr. Gaillard Hunt on the archives of the federal government outside the District of Columbia. The most important of these are the archives of the various legations and embassies, which fortunately have never suffered from fire. Thirty-nine field offices in the Indian service have records prior to 1873. Of the offices under the Treasury Department the custom-houses, mints, and assay offices have the most important records. Of the federal courts the only one that has preserved its records from the beginning is that at Hartford. Mr. Hunt's report showed how little attention has been paid to this class of federal archives and made it clear that prompt measures are necessary to ensure the preservation of valuable material.

The conference was devoted mainly to the consideration of a plan for a manual of archive practice or economy, similar in method to the manual of library economy prepared by the American Library Association. Mr. Victor H. Paltsits presented a tentative outline for the manual and indicated the general nature of its contents, dwelling more at length on such matters as official and public use of the archives, sites and plans of archive buildings and their heating, ventilation, and lighting, classification and cataloguing of archives, and the restoration or repair of manuscripts. The general discussion was opened by Mr. Waldo G. Leland, who emphasized the utility of profiting from European experience, pointed out the distinction between public archives and historical manuscripts, and reiterated the necessity of observing the principle of the *respect des fonds* in the classification of records. Mr. Dunbar Rowland pointed out the desirability of adopting uniform methods of classification throughout the archives of the various states, urged the adoption of the most liberal regulations respecting the use of archives, and dwelt upon the qualifications of the archivist. The problems of local records were dealt with by Mr. Solon J. Buck and Mr. Herbert O. Brigham, who urged the standardization and abbreviation of forms, eliminating much useless legal verbiage. Mr. James J. Tracy told of his experiences as chief of the Massachusetts Division of Archives and asked for the co-operation of historical and hereditary societies in

securing suitable legislation. The advantage of publicity in arousing general interest in archives was dwelt upon by Dr. Henry S. Burrage and Mr. Thomas C. Quinn.

The conference on ancient history was held in one of the buildings of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, on the same morning. In the absence of Mr. Fairbanks of the Boston Museum, Professor William S. Ferguson of Harvard presided and introduced Professor George F. Moore, of the same university, who opened the conference with a presentation of Oriental history as a field for investigation. He pointed out that recent explorations had revolutionized the knowledge held a century ago and had raised innumerable fresh problems—problems of race, of language, of chronology, and of intercourse. The fact that Syria was the connecting link between the three centres of ancient civilization would suggest that there the most important discoveries of the future would be made. This speaker was followed by Professor Henry A. Sill, of Cornell University, who, with a wealth of illustration, showed what had been done and what remained to do in the Graeco-Roman field. Among other things he suggested, as work ready to be entered upon, a new edition of Diodorus, and of the fragments of the Greek historians, and a history of ancient historiography. The great mass of material which has been brought to light, much of which is yet unpublished, gives opportunity for a study of the economic and social, as well as the political life of the Greeks and Romans. As special fields in which yet unworked material exists in abundance the speaker suggested the origins of Greek and of Italian civilization, the expansion of Hellenism, Egypt in Ptolemaic and Roman days, and the Roman Republic. The chairman, in commenting upon the papers, said that he stood appalled at two things, the number of tools necessary for the work, and the immense fertility of the field. Professor Breasted, of the University of Chicago, in opening the discussion laid still further stress upon the first of these thoughts. The historian of the ancient world must master Oriental philology and archaeology, yet he must primarily be neither a philologist nor an archaeologist if his work is to be acceptable. At the present time he does not possess so much as a satisfactory handbook. This lack must be supplied and a mass of material must be published, as the primary steps. Professor Robert W. Rogers, of Drew Theological Seminary, briefly suggested that the great need was for intensive work. Dr. Ralph V. Magoffin, of Johns Hopkins University, advocated extensive work on the history of Roman law, attempts toward synthesis of the results of excavations already made, studies in municipal affairs, and monographs on the Roman em-

perors. Mr. Oric Bates, who closed the discussion, limited his remarks to Libya, a region which he regarded as worthy of far more attention than it had received. The people of ancient Libya were probably of the same race as those north of the Mediterranean, so that problems of ethnology and of philology must be studied here which are closely related to those of Greece and Italy. Materials casting light on problems of trade, of colonization, of culture, are all to be found here. Themes especially in need of investigation are, the connections between Libya and Syria, the relations between the Greek colonists of Cyrene and the natives, and those of the Carthaginians to the races which surrounded them.

The same morning's conference on historical bibliography, presided over by Professor Ernest C. Richardson, librarian of Princeton University, was entirely occupied with the discussion of an exceedingly clever and suggestive paper by Professor Carl Becker of the University of Kansas, on the reviewing of historical books. The speaker began by setting forth the dissatisfaction which he and many others have felt with the present status of the art of reviewing historical books in this country. He believed the main faults of the system to be due to the attempt to combine in one notice of a book two elements essentially different, on the one hand presentation of purely bibliographical data respecting the form, content, sources, and characteristics of a book, and on the other hand an attempt at critical discourse concerning it, shaped in accordance with literary traditions which in the main are inappropriate to the task as actually executed. Many books, he declared, did not at all require this ambitious and pseudo-literary treatment. On the other hand, we need a much greater amount of critical writing of a high order. He therefore advocated a segregation of the bibliographical or non-critical data respecting all books noticed, the undisputed descriptive facts concerning them, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the critical articles in which *some* books, deserving such fuller treatment or lending themselves to it appropriately, should be made the theme of more intellectual discussion and of appreciations more useful toward the improvement of the historical art. The managing editor of this journal expressed his appreciation of the value of Mr. Becker's thoughts, and agreed with cordiality that benefit should be derived from them in the conduct of, for instance, such a journal as this; but he believed that practical obstacles stood in the way of carrying out in its entirety so drastic a programme. He dwelt upon the evils which he has felt to exist in the reviewing of historical books among us—the frequent inadequacy, the insufficient amount of penetrating thought, the rareness with which the higher levels of criticism are

reached, and above all, the excess of leniency which, he held, constantly characterized the bulk of the reviews which it is his function to print. He of course disclaimed all desire for slashing reviews, bad manners, or unkindness; and he duly valued the amiability of his profession and the unreserved amenity which can now characterize the meetings of reviewer and reviewed at the sessions of the American Historical Association. But he believed that our book notices could never do what they ought for the improvement of our profession if the writers of signed or unsigned reviews shirked their duty of setting forth deficiencies with an unsparing hand.

Mr. W. Dawson Johnston, librarian of Columbia University, took up the subject from the librarians' point of view, expressing their wish for a greater mass of bibliographical notes, helpful in the choice of books, more critical notes, more analysis, showing contents not shown by titles, and the like. Others, speaking from the same point of view, made evident the need of criticisms that follow quickly upon publication, and of larger and more systematic information on foreign books, while teachers and investigators desired a greater number of those surveys of recent literature and recent progress in special fields which this journal has occasionally afforded, and which it will endeavor more often to provide in the future.

The session on military history, of Saturday morning, was a conference between representatives of the military and the historical profession for the discussion of a practical problem—how to establish the scientific study of military history, making its results of value to the soldier, the civilian, and the nation.<sup>1</sup> The conference was presided over in turn by Professor Hart and Professor William A. Dunning. Professor R. M. Johnston of Harvard, who opened the discussion, spoke of the disrepute into which old-fashioned military history had justly fallen, the growing attention to the subject, especially its technical phases, in Europe, indicated the wealth of material for American military history, and urged the furthering of the study through such methods as the co-operation of military and historical experts, the greater recognition of military history at army headquarters, the establishment of seminar work in the universities, and the founding of a journal and a national society. Captain Arthur L. Conger, of the Army Service Schools at Fort Leavenworth, maintained that any real solution of the problem must include the creation of an historical section of the General Staff. Mr. Oswald G. Villard, who may be said to have represented the civilian pacifist, feared that such a solution would result in the writing of history with a

<sup>1</sup> A stenographic report of the conference is printed in the *Infantry Journal*, January-February, 1913, pp. 545-578.

biased point of view, although an historical section of the General Staff might well work for the development of instruction in history in the military schools. He hoped rather for the organization of a national civilian society in which military men should participate. Colonel T. L. Livermore, U. S. A. retired, stated that he had long urged the creation of an historical section of the General Staff, and asserted his belief in the ability of the soldier to write history unbiased by his profession; he thought also that the time had come for the establishment of a national society for military history. Professor F. M. Fling of Nebraska was of the opinion that military history should be dealt with by military men with historical training and pointed out the necessity of laying a foundation in detailed studies. Major J. W. McAndrew of the Army War College, detailed by the War Department to attend the conference, held that for the successful study of military history the collaboration of military men and historians was indispensable. He advocated the creation of an historical section of the General Staff and maintained that an important purpose of military history was to demonstrate to the nation the cost of unpreparedness. Major George H. Shelton, editor of the *Infantry Journal*, felt that the start in the right direction lay through the General Staff and asked for the encouragement of the American Historical Association in securing the necessary legislation. The discussion was brought to a close by the president of the association, Colonel Roosevelt, who declared that military history could not be treated as something apart from national history. Military history should be written primarily by military men and under the observation of the General Staff, but with the collaboration of civilian historians. He emphasized especially the lessons which our military history should bring home to the nation, illustrating his point with personal experiences in the war of 1898 and with the mistakes and failures of the War of 1812. The conference closed with the appointment of a committee to consider the best method of furthering the study and presentation of military history, and to make at the next meeting of the American Historical Association a report upon this subject. The committee was constituted by the chair as follows: Professor R. M. Johnston, chairman, Professor F. M. Fling, Colonel T. L. Livermore, Major J. W. McAndrew, and Major George H. Shelton. Later the Council of the Association requested this committee to co-operate with the committee on the programme for the next annual meeting, in framing for that occasion a programme for a second conference on military history.

The increasing interest in the history teachers' conference was shown by the numbers that assembled in the Museum of Fine Arts

on Saturday afternoon. After a short business meeting of the New England History Teachers' Association, which met in joint session with the teachers of the Historical Association, Professor Ferguson, the chairman, introduced Professor John O. Sumner, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the chairman of the Committee on the Equipment for the Teaching of History in High Schools and Colleges, who presented the report of the committee. This report summarized the returns received from 150 preparatory schools and ten colleges, most of the 150 schools using the four courses recommended by the Committee of Seven. Some of the general observations that resulted from the survey thus afforded were, that while libraries are most cordial in their co-operation, city museums are not used as they might be, that there is no conspicuous difference between the results obtained by private and by public schools, that the importance of a large number of duplicates in libraries is overlooked, that maps are sadly deficient, that pictures are in very general use, and that a number of schools possess lanterns. Professor Henry Johnson, of Teachers' College, opened the discussion with the suggestion that the report, though valuable, had lessened its usefulness by attempting too much, and that the important thing is not the accumulation of material, which is comparatively easy, but the proper using of the material when collected. Dr. Daniel C. Knowlton, of the Central High School, Newark, New Jersey, in his remarks further emphasized the idea that the stress should be laid not on the acquisition of the material but on its use. Even in the most poorly equipped school, material by which the past can be made real, the object of all illustrative material, will be found by the skillful teacher. Professor Arthur P. Butler, of Morristown, New Jersey, added the suggestion that the vital and the difficult thing is to set the pupil himself to work with the material, and to teach him facility in reproducing what he has heard and read. In the general discussion which followed Professor Sumner stated that the report did not yet reach the matter of utilization of material, but that the committee hoped to be of use in that respect as well as in the selection of material. Professor Ernest F. Henderson suggested ways of using the current *History Teacher's Magazine* in illustration of the general subject, and Mr. G. H. Howard, of Springfield, Massachusetts, dwelt further on the necessity of teaching the pupil to give expression to his knowledge. At the close of the session those present were invited to Simmons College to inspect the rooms arranged there illustrating with books, maps, pictures, and other material the recommended high-school courses. The space given to industrial history proved most popular, probably because of the greater opportunity afforded for illustrative work by the pupils.

The ninth annual conference of historical societies was held in the building of the Massachusetts Historical Society on Saturday afternoon, with President Henry Lefavour of Simmons College, president of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, as chairman. Only two papers were presented but each was of unusual merit. Mr. Charles K. Bolton, librarian of the Boston Athenaeum, dealt with the subject, not frequently discussed at meetings of the Association, of "Genealogy and History". He pointed out that "the vicissitudes of families conceal the very sources of political and economic history" and urged that the genealogist should not concern himself merely with the names and vital statistics of those whose relationships he records, but also with their environment, activities, and state of culture, thus making a genuine contribution to history which the historian cannot afford to ignore. In discussion of the subject Dr. H. W. Van Loon indicated the close relation between genealogy and the continuance of reigning families and described the careful preservation of genealogical material in the Netherlands, while Dr. F. A. Woods of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology spoke briefly of genealogy as an aid in the study of heredity, and pointed out the unusual degree of interrelationship among the personages most eminent in American history. Mr. Worthington C. Ford's paper on the Massachusetts Historical Society was exceedingly suggestive. Indicating the conditions in 1790 which brought the society into existence, Mr. Ford sketched the broad lines of the society's development to the present day, showing the part played by such factors as the personality of its membership, the gradual delimitation of the scope of its activities, and its policy in the collection and publication of material. With regard to this latter it was stated that "the wholesome lesson was early learned that the society must support its publications and could not hope to derive any profit from them". In the matter of collection Mr. Ford made a plea for the proper geographical distribution of material, pointing out how historical societies may act as clearing-houses of archival and other original material that has gone astray. The principal matter of business that came before the conference was the report by Mr. Dunbar Rowland for the committee on co-operative activities on the progress of the catalogue of documents in French archives relating to the history of the Mississippi Valley. The committee was authorized to secure additional funds, and \$750 was pledged at the conference by the Illinois Historical Library, the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, the Cambridge Historical Society, and the Wisconsin Historical Society.

The principal paper in the Conference on Medieval History, of

which Professor George B. Adams of Yale University was chairman, was that which is printed upon a later page of the present issue, on Profitable Fields of Investigation in Medieval History, by Professor J. W. Thompson of the University of Chicago. In discussing it Professor J. T. Shotwell of Columbia University dwelt upon the large possibilities which lie before American students in respect to constructive work in medieval history, European scholars having performed for them the needful toil of getting the materials ready. He likewise, in a similar spirit, adverted to the fact that early medieval church history, the materials of which had largely been already prepared by clerics, affords much work for laymen to do, in examining such topics, for instance, as the government of the *patrimonium Petri*, papal finance, the extension of Christian morals over the north of Europe, the sacraments considered from the point of view of anthropology, and the archaeology of the Middle Ages, especially the prehistoric archaeology of the North. Professor A. B. White of the University of Minnesota dwelt upon the crucial importance of a much larger amount of work in the critical study of the meanings and uses of medieval terms. Dr. Howard L. Gray of Harvard University spoke of the necessity of many local studies before medieval economic history can be securely advanced, and of the difficulties presented by the agrarian history of France, and in a less degree of England, in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries. Among the others who spoke, Professor W. E. Lunt laid emphasis upon critical studies of the chroniclers and of the documents respecting taxation; Professor Edgar H. MacNeal, of the Old French and Middle High German romances; and Professor A. C. Howland, of the history of medieval education and of the legal institutions of the Middle Ages.

The two remaining conferences, occupied with American history and with modern history respectively, took place at Harvard University on the morning of Monday, December 30. All the sessions of Monday morning and Monday afternoon, including the annual business meeting, were held in Cambridge.

Those interested primarily in the subject of American history held their conference in Emerson Hall, Professor Frederick J. Turner presiding. Professor Dodd's paper on Profitable Fields of Investigation in American History, 1815-1860, which appears on later pages of this journal, pointed to a wide range of unexplored or partially explored territory and provided food for a fruitful discussion which was opened by Professor Ulrich B. Phillips, of the University of Michigan. He took exception to Professor Dodd's statement that slave property was the most valuable investment in a

Southern community, giving explicit reasons for his opinion. He stated his belief that the greatest need in the period under discussion was a study of economic and social conditions, district by district, with especial emphasis on the social conditions. Professor Theodore C. Smith, of Williams College, felt that Professor Dodd had ignored the northeast and the central states, and had narrowed his interest by using an inadequate formula. He believed a study of the political history of a single state would be of the greatest use and suggested Pennsylvania as a fertile subject. The development of the modern party he also cited as needing much more investigation. Professor Allen Johnson of Yale expressed a desire that for a time 1861 be forgotten and the ante-bellum period be treated as preliminary to our own days, particularly along the line of political processes and party machinery. Professor Homer C. Hockett, of Ohio State University, suggested as a principle of selection, a necessity in all historical work, the connection of past events with present-day problems such as the third-party movement, the evolution of the wage problem, and the manufacturing interests. Professor P. Orman Ray, of Pennsylvania State College, followed Professor Smith's suggestion for detailed work on Pennsylvania politics from 1815 to 1828, by citing numerous topics, among others a study of Pennsylvania financial history, a history of the railroads of the state, the connection between the railroads and legislation, the proceedings of the various state constitutional conventions, the reform movements in connection with debtor laws and liquor legislation, and finally suggested a series of monographs on the presidential campaigns. Professor Jonas Viles, of the University of Missouri, emphasized the need for scholarly local history investigated from the national point of view. Miss Katharine Coman, of Wellesley College, brought to the consideration of the conference research beyond the Mississippi where no slavery question was known. The material for this work, diaries of the early explorers and settlers, letters, business papers, newspapers, early church records, recollections of living pioneers, exists in great quantities, but much of it of value has already been destroyed and more will disappear with each decade that passes.

The conference on modern history, held at the same hour, in the lecture hall of the Fogg Museum of Art, was presided over by Professor Charles D. Hazen of Smith College. The principal paper laid before the conference was one by Professor Edwin F. Gay of Harvard, on the History of Commerce as a Field for Investigation, and commercial history remained the sole topic of the conference. Professor Gay set out with great force, clearness, and grasp of general

aspects a wide variety of topics in the history of modern commerce upon which greater light was needed, and expressed with particular vigor the need both of greater breadth and of far greater exactness in the presentation and use of materials, especially of statistical materials, for commercial history. Too much of the history of commerce which has been written is merely romantic fiction.

Professor Clive Day of Yale expressed cordial agreement with Professor Gay in his demand for a study of the history of commerce in its broader aspects, leading to a better understanding of the successive economic stages. He joined him in pleading for more exact methods in studying the history of commerce, and called attention to such recent works as those by Madame Bang, Becht, and Wätjen, giving a statistical basis for study. He emphasized the importance of the constitutional aspects of commercial history, and urged that students should not be blinded by an exaggerated belief in the importance of commercial policy.

Professor A. L. P. Dennis of Wisconsin spoke of the history of the trade of the English *in* India, especially in the seventeenth century, as distinguished from the commerce between England and India, of which more is known. Added materials in print have now made it possible to make intensive studies of such subjects as Indian banking, private trading of servants of the East India Company, prices, and the like. Professor William E. Lingelbach of the University of Pennsylvania, remarking that the period from 1803 to 1813 had mainly been dealt with from the military and political points of view, advocated a much fuller study of the Napoleonic period as consisting in a great commercial struggle. The sources for the history of English commercial policy during this period are voluminous, those for the French even richer; and there is need of many regional studies on the history and effect of the Continental System upon particular areas. American consular reports, enclosures in the diplomatic correspondence, and the manuscripts of private firms, like the five hundred volumes of the papers of Stephen Girard, afford many materials for the discussion of profitable topics like the Baltic trade of that time, the commercial position of the subsidiary states under Napoleon, the amelioration of the system by licenses, English and French, smuggling, and places like Halifax and Amelia Island, which constituted strategic points comparable to Heligoland.

Mr. Abbott P. Usher of Cornell University dwelt upon the international aspects of commercial history and the need of observing them in spite of the natural temptation to observe national boundaries unduly because the deposits of material are national. He instanced Schmoller's history of the Prussian grain trade in the

*Acta Borussica*, in which the ignoring of the relations of Polish and Baltic trade to Prussian leave the book a work of erudition rather than a vital history of important movements; and the history of the bill of exchange, Goldschmidt's work being confined to Italian sources instead of following in the archives of all important countries alike a subject which is essentially cosmopolitan.

Mr. Clarence H. Haring of Bryn Mawr spoke of the Archives of the Indies in Seville, and of the opportunities which they afford for a study of the origin, organization, and history of Spanish colonial commerce, and especially of the Spanish silver fleets, for which the accounts of the treasurers of the Casa de Contratacion and of the various colonial treasurers afford ample materials, while the registers preserved in Seville of ships sailing to and from America are invaluable for the general study of colonial trade and navigation. Dr. Stewart L. Mims of Yale, from the point of view of a student of the French colonial empire, adverted to the need of many special studies of individual colonies in the Antilles, individual ports of France, and individual divisions of French colonial commerce.

Dr. N. S. B. Gras of Clark College closed the discussion by remarks on a group of new sources for the history of English customs and commerce, namely, the great mass of Port Books and Coast Bonds recently saved from destruction and brought to attention at the Public Record Office, and in which the history of English commerce in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries can be followed in minute detail of ships, exports, and destinations.

A special session of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, presided over by its president, Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites, of Wisconsin, was held on Monday morning, the general subject of the four papers read being New England and the West. Professor Archer B. Hulbert brought new light to bear, from his investigation of the Craigie Papers in the library of the American Antiquarian Society, on the history of the Scioto Company and its short-lived and unhappy settlement of Gallipolis. The Scioto Company, he stated, had no real organization, but was composed of Colonel Duer, Andrew Craigie, and Royal Flint, as principal associates, who with others styled themselves "trustees", and, under the wing of the Ohio Company, attempted to carry on a speculation pure and simple. Their methods were the purchase of United States claims, the attempt, through foreign financiers such as Brissot de Warville, to secure transfers of the foreign debt or to make loans abroad on Scioto stock, and the exchange of Scioto shares for those of other corporations. The speculators, Mr. Hulbert stated, had no intention of exploiting and settling the region on which they held options, gave

no such right to the French company, and should not be held directly responsible for the Gallipolis episode. In the second paper, Dr. Solon J. Buck controverted the generally accepted view that the people of early Illinois came almost entirely from the South and held all "Yankees" in aversion. On the basis of statistical study of the nativity of office-holders in Illinois before 1833, he showed that the New England element was about twelve per cent. (one-third of the northern element). The participation of New Englanders in Illinois politics was greatest from 1818 to 1824, and the part they played in the slavery struggle was distinctly honorable. The New England emigration was especially strong just after the War of 1812. Professor Karl F. Geiser, dealing with the early New England influence in the Western Reserve, pointed out that the social and political institutions of that region had developed out of New England Puritanism modified by forces springing out of the new soil to which it was transferred. The settlers from New England formed the nuclei of the various communities, the leadership of which they retained, shaping the development of religion and educational institutions, long after they were outnumbered by other elements.

Mrs. Lois K. Mathews's paper on the Mayflower Compact and its Descendants developed the idea that compact-making was a well-known process to the Americans of 1775, and survived after 1865, while side by side with the idea of compact, indeed as a corollary to it, developed that of secession. The plantation covenants of early New England, such as those of Providence, Exeter, and Dover, were discussed. The New England Confederation of 1643 represents the same principle on a larger scale, and the Articles of Confederation were in a sense a still more developed outgrowth. It was not, therefore, theoretical knowledge alone which the delegates to the Constitutional Convention possessed, but much practical experience of compacts. The application of the compact theory by no means ceased with the adoption of the Constitution, for numerous colonies or settlements in western territory bound themselves by compact. The conclusions reached were, that government by compact was evolved from practical necessity, not from theoretical speculation; that its beginnings are to be found in the separatist church covenant; that the germ of the larger compacts is found in the town compacts, and finally, that the institution often accompanied further settlement, changing its character to suit changing conditions; all of which suggest the need of studying the church covenant and the town compact, (1) among settlers from New England, (2) among settlers from the southern seaboard, and (3) among the Scotch-Irish.

On the afternoon of the same day, the last whole day of the ses-

sions, the Historical Association and the Political Science Association met in joint session at the New Lecture Hall of Harvard University. The first two papers of the session pertained to the field of political science, the last to history. President Harry A. Garfield, of Williams College, in a paper entitled Good Government and the Suffrage, skillfully led up to the conclusion that for the purposes of good government a universal franchise was neither a danger nor an essential, however desirable it might be for other reasons. Professor Adam Shortt of the Canadian Civil Service Commission explained with some detail the historical development which resulted in the present relationship between the Canadian executive and legislative bodies. The first of the papers in the field of history was presented by Professor Frank M. Anderson, of the University of Minnesota, and dealt with the Enforcement of the Alien and Sedition Laws of 1798. While the Alien Law was never actually enforced, Burk, the editor of the *Time Piece*, of New York, was obliged to go into hiding until the close of the administration, and the departure of General Victor Collot was all that prevented action being taken against him. Several prosecutions that occurred before the actual passage of the Sedition Law (July 14, 1798) are often alluded to as Sedition Law cases. The number of persons arrested under the act seems to have been about twenty-five and at least sixteen were indicted, of whom ten came to trial and were pronounced guilty. These cases were discussed in four classes: proceedings aimed at prominent Republican newspapers; proceedings aimed at minor Republican papers; proceedings against important individuals; and cases against unimportant persons. Charges of unfairness in all these cases were numerous. It seems true that the juries could scarcely be called impartial, and the defendant was not in all cases given a fair chance to present his side of the case.

Professor E. D. Adams followed with an interesting paper on the Point of View of the British Traveller in America, 1810-1860, the object of which was to study "the mental attitude" of the writers of the various accounts. Guided by this principle one may group the British writers into five classes. Those writing in the decade 1810-1820 were middle-class Englishmen, interested in agriculture, discontented with the social order at home, and attracted by the industrial opportunity offered by this country. For the second period the books were of two distinct types: books written by the laborers themselves dilating on their wages, their food, their comfortable housing; and books written by those whose attitude toward American political institutions was distinctly critical. The third decade, 1830-1840, was characterized solely by writers whose judgments, sometimes

friendly and sometimes unfriendly, were predetermined by their political opinions. From 1840 to 1850 the majority of travellers were primarily observers, apparently without strong bias. From 1850 to 1860, as in the decade from 1830 to 1840, the writers were concerned chiefly with political institutions in America, the feeling of friendliness predominating.

The last evening of the sessions in Boston was given to the reading, before a general audience, of papers in European history. The first was a brilliant discourse "Anent the Middle Ages", by Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University, which we shall have the pleasure of presenting to our readers in a future number. After some discussion of the beginnings of modern tolerance, and their relation to the demarcation of the Middle Ages, Mr. Burr showed how medieval history may most properly be thought of as the period when Christian theocracy was the usual ideal; how, beginning the Middle Ages with Constantine, we may rightly allow them to overlap ancient history at one end; and how, overlapping modern history at the other, we cannot think of them as ending till, after Luther and Calvin, the ecclesiastical City of God is supplanted by the lay state.

In the second paper, Antecedents of the Quattrocento, Mr. Henry Osborn Taylor of New York took for his topic the fundamental identity of relationship borne by the Middle Ages as well as the humanists of the Quattrocento to the antique past from which they both drew the substance of their thought. In each succeeding medieval century, as in the Quattrocento, scholars were always reaching back, beyond that which they had received from their immediate predecessors, in the fruitful endeavor to appropriate and profit by a larger share of the great antique past. In this respect the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries resemble the twelfth and thirteenth.

In a systematic and thorough descriptive paper on the Court of Star Chamber, Professor Edward P. Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania set forth in entertaining fashion the composition and functions of the court, its relations to monarch and council and Parliament, its practices and procedure, and the true facts as to its operations and the part it played in the history of the time—all supported and enlivened by concrete examples drawn from exhaustive researches. The paper will at a later time be printed in this journal.

Mr. William R. Thayer's paper entitled "Crispi: a Legend in the Making" consisted in a comparison, made step by step through the successive stages of Crispi's career, between the actual historic facts and the representation of those facts which is now coming before the public as the result of Crispi's dealings with his own papers and of the publications, out of that collection and from other sources,

which have been made by his nephew and other apologists. An anonymous article in the *Nation* of January 16 will give to students, at considerable extent, an excellent notion of what was said upon this interesting topic by Mr. Thayer. He described the early days of conspiracy, the relations of discipleship with Mazzini, the Orsini episode, and the remarkable part which Crispi played in the Sicilian Expedition as lieutenant of Garibaldi, as private secretary, and as intriguer for Sicilian and personal interests rather than for those of united Italy; the adhesion of Crispi to the monarchy, his long career as parliamentary privateer, his periods of ministerial power, his policy in external and internal affairs. At every step he showed how nepotic piety and that of lesser adherents has been of late sophisticating the actual facts and creating the legend of a high-minded, unselfish, and farseeing statesman.

In view of the lateness of the hour which had now been reached, Professor John M. Vincent of the Johns Hopkins University abstained from reading his paper on Sumptuary Laws in the Eighteenth Century. The paper was intended to show the duration of this intimate paternal legislation in certain of the old independent cities of Switzerland where the ordinances were persistently renewed and re-enacted throughout the century. The French Revolution seems to close the period of serious "blue-law" making. Mr. Vincent has been investigating the extent to which these ordinances were enforced. The execution was usually in the hands of a social court or commission for the reformation of morals. In Basel the docket of this court is complete from 1674 to 1797. In Zürich the record for the eighteenth century is fairly complete, and in other cities information is fragmentary, but interesting irregularities are seen in the enforcement. Spasmodic revivals of stringency are followed by neglect, with a general tendency to mildness as the century advances, until the attempt to enforce strictly sumptuary regulation is abandoned.

The final session of the Association, on the last morning of the year, was devoted to a series of papers in American history, of which the first, entitled the New Columbus, had been prepared by Mr. Henry P. Biggar, representative in Europe of the Archives of the Dominion of Canada.

Our scanty information as to the life of Columbus has been largely based on the biography published by his son Fernando. This, Mr. Henry Vignaud has in recent volumes tried to show, is in large measure composed of forged documents, and he has also attempted to demonstrate that much of what Columbus told of himself was untrue, and most important of all, that he was seeking not a new

route to the East, but new islands in the ocean when he sailed to the west in 1492. Mr. Vignaud, in order to support this theory, regards the entire correspondence with Toscanelli as a forgery on the part of Bartholomew Columbus, the brother of Christopher. There are however certain facts that militate against this theory. We know that in 1494 the Duke of Ferrara wrote to Florence asking for Toscanelli's notes on the island recently discovered by the Spaniards. We know that what Columbus proposed to King John of Portugal was a search for the island Cipangu and that that was what he on his return from the first voyage declared that he had found. The letter given to Columbus by Isabella, April 30, 1492, was apparently intended for the Grand Khan of Cathay. Finally, the introduction to the journal of the first voyage, written by Columbus, seems to prove that he expected to reach the East.

Dr. Clarence W. Bowen's paper on the Charter of Connecticut sketched briefly the early history of the various settlements in Connecticut, the procuring of the charter by John Winthrop, agent for the colony in England, the enmity of Edward Randolph to the colony, and the attack on the charter by Andros. He described the efforts of Colonel Benjamin Fletcher and Governor Joseph Dudley to gain control of the military forces of Connecticut and the numerous appeals made to the king throughout the eighteenth century, to support the charter. To this he added illustrations showing its importance to Connecticut in the present day.

Professor Claude H. Van Tyne in his paper on Religious and Sectarian Forces as Causes of the American Revolution declared that in a sense the American Revolution was simply the Puritan and Anglican struggle of the early seventeenth century deferred 150 years, and removed to another land. There followed a discussion of all of those controversies in the earlier colonial history which kept the colonists suspicious of encroachments by the Anglican Church. Then the annoying activities of the Bishop of London were considered, and the disallowance by the British government of colonial laws on religious subjects. The effect of giving all important British offices in America to Episcopalians was discussed, and the struggle over the proposed American episcopate. From this the speaker passed to reflections upon the effect of the preaching by Calvinistic ministers, throughout the colonial period, of the doctrines of Locke, Milton, Sidney, and Hoadly. Especial attention was given to the opposition to the Episcopal doctrines of submission and non-resistance. The preaching of the non-Anglican ministers between the Stamp Act and the outbreak of war was discussed, and evidence was submitted to show the extent and character of their

influence, then and after Concord and Lexington. The discussion here turned to the activity of Revolutionary leaders in the use of religious forces, with especial emphasis upon the appeal of Samuel Adams to Puritan fanaticism when the Catholic religion was recognized in Quebec. There followed an account of the attack on the "Divine Rights" doctrine and its effect in removing the last barrier to independence. In closing, the speaker presented the results of a study of a large number of Revolutionary biographies, which show the adhesion of about eighty per cent. of the non-Episcopalians to the Whig party, and of about seventy-five per cent. of the Episcopalians to the Loyalist party. The speaker expressed the belief that conflicting political ideas, and not tea or taxes, caused the American secession from the British Empire, and that the Puritan clergy had a large part in planting the prevalent political ideals which were antagonistic to those dominant in England.

Mr. Charles Francis Adams's stirring paper on the fight of the *Constitution* and the *Guerriere*—"August 19, 1812, at 6.30 P.M.; the Birth of a World Power"—follows in full upon a later page.

The veteran historian Dr. James Schouler was not able to be present on Saturday morning. The paper which he had prepared developed the thesis that to-day we have material which enables us to form a far more just opinion of Andrew Johnson than did his contemporaries. The manuscript collection of Johnson papers placed in the Library of Congress and the *Diary of Gideon Welles*, recently published, have furnished vindication for that president's character and official acts. His early reconstruction measures showed courage and ability, his chief mistakes being his failure to unite with the moderate Republicans on a definite policy, his neglect to take the younger Republican leaders into his confidence, and his faults of taste in the canvass of 1866, in which his speeches offended the northern audiences that heard them.

The business meeting of the Association was held at Cambridge on Monday afternoon with Vice-President Dunning in the chair. The report of the secretary showed a total membership of 2846. The treasurer reported net disbursements of \$11,619, with net receipts of \$10,823. The total assets of the Association were \$27,255. The report of the Executive Council included, for the first time, the presentation of a formal budget for the expenditures for 1913; and recommended that a committee of five be appointed at the present meeting to prepare nominations for office to be voted on at the next annual meeting. The recommendation was adopted. The new policy with regard to nominations will allow a longer consideration of the

matter of elections and will afford opportunity for members of the Association to make suggestions to the committee. Upon recommendation by the council it was voted to accept the invitation of Columbia, South Carolina, to hold in that city a part of the annual meeting for 1913, the major portion of which is to be held in Charleston. It was also voted to accept the invitation from the Universities of Chicago and Illinois and Northwestern University to hold the annual meeting of 1914 in Chicago. The Association furthermore voted to hold a special meeting in San Francisco in July, 1915, in response to invitations received from the Pacific Coast Branch and the Panama Exposition committee.

The report of the Pacific Coast Branch was presented by Professor E. D. Adams, who gave a brief account of its tenth annual meeting, held in Berkeley. The next meeting will be held at Los Angeles. The chairman of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, Mr. Ford, reported that through the generosity of the Adams family the commission would offer as its next report the private letters of William Vans Murray to John Adams, 1797-1801. This material being of national interest, in private possession, and not likely otherwise to be printed, was considered especially appropriate for inclusion in a report of the commission. For the Public Archives Commission, Professor Ames stated that reports were in progress on the archives of California and Louisiana, and that arrangements were being made for securing reports on Montana and Wyoming. The activity of the commission during the past year has been principally along two lines: the preparation of a manual of archive practice or economy and the securing of information about federal archives located outside of the District of Columbia. An outline of the archive manual had been discussed at the conference of archivists just held and it was hoped that by next year some preliminary publication could be prepared. The work of securing information respecting federal archives outside of the District of Columbia has been taken up by Mr. Gaillard Hunt, who has secured an executive order from the President calling for the information desired. Professor Ames also stated that the commission would present as part of its report a list, prepared under the supervision of Professor C. M. Andrews, of the reports and representations relative to America made by the British Board of Trade to the king in council, Parliament, the secretary of state, and other authorities. Dr. J. F. Jameison made an informal report for the council committee on a national archive building; while uncertain whether any action would be taken during the present session, the committee was continuing to call public attention to the need of such a building and making sys-

tematic efforts to have various historical societies make representations to Congress upon the subject.

The Committee on Publications reported through its chairman, Professor Farrand, that the Adams prize essay for 1911, Miss Brown's *Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum*, had been printed and would be distributed shortly. The committee has decided to reprint the first essay to receive the Adams prize, that of David S. Muzzey on *The Spiritual Franciscans*. Mr. Farrand stated that the total sales of the four essays already issued amounted to 1674 copies, the number of the standing subscribers to the whole series being only 159. He especially urged that this number should be made as large as possible. The committee announced that it will be impossible to publish the biennial handbook during the coming year. The report of the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW was presented by its chairman, Professor George B. Adams, who stated that owing to a decrease of expenses the board had been able to return \$300 to the Association. The editors had agreed with the advisory committee of the *History Teacher's Magazine* upon a natural and logical definition of the fields of the respective publications. Professor Henry Johnson presented a report for the advisory board of the *History Teacher's Magazine* which showed that the outlook for that publication is very encouraging, the number of subscribers having nearly trebled during the past year.

For the Committee on Bibliography, Dr. E. C. Richardson stated that three pieces of work were being carried on or being considered: a list of sets of works on European history to be found in American libraries, a bibliography of American travels, and a union list of historical periodicals. The list of works on European history is now in press; a revised and improved edition of it is to be published under the editorship of Dr. Walter Lichtenstein. The bibliography of American travels is waiting for the procuring of a suitable editor, and the matter of a union list of periodicals is to be taken up with the publishing board of the American Library Association. Professor Cheyney reported that a considerable part of the material for the first volume of the bibliography of modern English history had been gathered. The English committee, he stated, had made a contract with John Murray for the publication of the work and the American committee planned to arrange with an American publisher for issuing the work in America. It has been decided to include the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the plan, thus making the bibliography cover the whole modern period. Dr. Jameson reported respecting the series of *Original Narratives of Early*

*American History* the facts and announcements set forth from time to time in the "Notes and News" of this journal. Professor D. C. Munro reported that the work of the committee on the preparation of teachers of history in schools had been mainly directed to arousing interest in the subject throughout the country. The committee expects to publish a formal report in the near future. The chairman of the Justin Winsor Prize Committee, Professor Van Tyne, stated that the Winsor prize had been awarded to Dr. A. C. Cole for his essay on the Whig Party in the South. The rules governing contributions for the prize essays were amended in such a way as to place the burden of preparing the manuscript of the successful essay for the printer upon the author rather than upon the Association.

Professor William A. Dunning, the first vice-president, was elected president of the Association for the ensuing year, Professors Andrew C. McLaughlin and H. Morse Stephens vice-presidents; Mr. Waldo G. Leland was re-elected secretary; Professor Charles H. Haskins secretary to the Council; Dr. Clarence W. Bowen treasurer; and Mr. A. Howard Clark curator. In the place of President Edwin E. Sparks and Professor Franklin L. Riley, who had served three terms on the Executive Council, Professors Archibald C. Coolidge and John M. Vincent were chosen.

#### OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

<i>President,</i>	Professor William A. Dunning, New York.
<i>First Vice-President,</i>	Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, Chicago.
<i>Second Vice-President,</i>	Professor H. Morse Stephens, Berkeley.
<i>Secretary,</i>	Waldo G. Leland, Carnegie Institution, Washington.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, 130 Fulton Street, New York.
<i>Secretary to the Council,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, Cambridge.
<i>Curator,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Smithsonian Institution.

*Executive Council* (in addition to the above-named officers):

Hon. Andrew D. White, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, <sup>1</sup>
President James B. Angell, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Frederick J. Turner, <sup>1</sup>
Henry Adams, <sup>1</sup>	Professor William M. Sloane, <sup>1</sup>
James Schouler, <sup>1</sup>	Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, <sup>1</sup>
James Ford Rhodes, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Fred M. Fling,

<sup>1</sup> Ex-presidents.

Charles Francis Adams, <sup>1</sup>	Professor James A. Woodburn,
Rear-Admiral Alfred T. Mahan, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Herman V. Ames,
Professor John B. McMaster, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Dana C. Munro,
Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Archibald C. Coolidge,
J. Franklin Jameson, <sup>1</sup>	Professor John M. Vincent.
Professor George B. Adams, <sup>1</sup>	

*Committees:*

*Committee on Programme for the Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting:*

Professor St. George L. Sioussat, Vanderbilt University, chairman; Waldo G. Leland, Samuel C. Mitchell, Ulrich B. Phillips, James T. Shotwell, Henry A. Sill.

*Committees on Local Arrangements:* For Charleston, Joseph W. Barnwell, chairman; Oliver J. Bond, Theodore D. Jervey, Harrison Randolph; for Columbia, Benjamin F. Taylor, chairman; Samuel C. Mitchell, Alexander S. Salley, Jr., Yates Snowden.

*Committee on Nominations:* Professor William MacDonald, Brown University, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, John S. Bassett, Edward B. Krehbiel, Franklin L. Riley.

*Editors of the American Historical Review:* George L. Burr, Edward P. Cheyney, J. Franklin Jameson, Andrew C. McLaughlin, James H. Robinson, Frederick J. Turner.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Worthington C. Ford, Massachusetts Historical Society, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, Julian P. Bretz, Archer B. Hulbert, Ulrich B. Phillips, Frederick G. Young.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor Claude H. Van Tyne, University of Michigan, chairman; Carl Becker, Carl R. Fish, J. G. deR. Hamilton, William MacDonald.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Professor George L. Burr, Cornell University, chairman; Edwin F. Gay, Charles D. Hazen, Laurence M. Larson, Albert B. White.

*Public Archives Commission:* Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Eugene C. Barker, Robert D. W. Connor, Gaillard Hunt, Jonas Viles, Henry E. Woods.

*Committee on Bibliography:* Professor Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; Clarence S. Brigham, W. Dawson Johnston, Walter Lichtenstein, Frederick J. Teggart, George Parker Winship.

*Committee on Publications:* Professor Max Farrand, Yale University, chairman; and (*ex officio*) George L. Burr, Worthing-

ton C. Ford, Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson, Waldo G. Leland, Victor H. Paltsits, Ernest C. Richardson, Claude H. Van Tyne.

*General Committee:* Professor Frederick L. Paxson, University of Wisconsin, chairman; Arthur I. Andrews, William K. Boyd, Pierce Butler, Isaac J. Cox, Frederic Duncalf, Miss Julia A. Flisch, Clarence S. Paine, Morgan P. Robinson, W. Roy Smith, David D. Wallace; and Waldo G. Leland and Haven W. Edwards, *ex officio*.

*Committee on a Bibliography of Modern English History:* Professor Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Ernest C. Richardson, Williston Walker.

*Committee on the Preparation of Teachers of History in Schools:* Professor Dana C. Munro, University of Wisconsin, chairman; Kendric C. Babcock, Charles E. Chadsey, Edgar Dawson, Haven W. Edwards, Robert A. Maurer.

*Conference of Historical Societies:* Thomas M. Owen, Montgomery, chairman; Solon J. Buck, secretary.

*Advisory Board of History Teacher's Magazine:* Professor Henry Johnson, Columbia University, chairman; George C. Sellery, St. George L. Sioussat (these two reappointed to serve three years); Fred M. Fling, Miss Blanche Hazard, James Sullivan.